

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-23, 25-28, and 30-35 are currently pending
- No claims are canceled.
- No claims are withdrawn.
- Claims 1, 10-19, 25-28, and 30 are amended.
- No claims are added.

The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed and do not include new matter. For example, the amendments to claim 1 are at least supported by paragraphs [0006], [0018] – [0019], and [0056] of the originally filed application. In addition, the amendments to claims 10 and 19 are at least supported by paragraph [0056] of the originally filed application. Further, the amendments to claim 30 are at least supported by paragraphs [0053]-[0054] and [0056] of the originally filed application.

Claim Objections

[0003] Claims 10-18 and 25-28 stands objected to because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 10-18 and 25-28 obviate these claim objections and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these objections.

Cited Documents

[0004] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Becker: U.S. Patent No. 6,301,579
- Vishnubhotla: U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0198889
- Becker '483: U.S. Patent No. 6,373,483
- Smith: U.S. Patent No. 6,591,274

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, and 21-23 Are Non-Obvious Over Becker and further in view of Vishnubhotla.

[0005] Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Becker and further in view of Vishnubhotla. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 1

[0006] Applicant submits that the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 1:

- “reprocessing, at the computing device, a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure”

With respect to Becker and these features of claim 1, page 7 of the Action states:

“Becker as applied above teaches processing, mining models and mining structures, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, but does not expressly teach reprocessing the model in response to a change in a respective mining structure.”

Thus, as indicated on page 7 of the Action, Becker does not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1.

[0007] Further, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker. For example, in contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla teach that data mining models need their knowledge bases refreshed from time to time because the fundamental characteristics of the underlying production data change over time. (See Vishnubhotla, paragraph [0075]). The cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Vishnubhotla teaches that data mining models are refreshed based on changes to an underlying data set and not reprocessing data mining models based on a change to a mining structure used to create the mining models, such as changes with respect to variables of the mining structure. In particular, changes to a mining structure are different from changes to a data set because changes to a mining structure can occur independent of changes to the data set. For example, changes to variables of the data structure can occur without changing values associated with the variables.

[0008] Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 3-9

[0009] Dependent claims 3-9 ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 3-9. Accordingly, claims 3-9 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 10

[0010] Applicant submits that the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 10:

- "reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, and wherein the change in the respective mining structure includes a change in the processing of data from the data set"

With respect to Becker and these features of claim 10, page 9 of the Action states:

"**Claims 10, 12-19, and 21-23** are rejected based on the same reasoning as one or more of the above claims."

With respect to claim 1, which is "one or more of the above claims," and Becker, page 7 of the Action states:

"Becker as applied above teaches processing, mining models and mining structures, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, but does not expressly teach reprocessing the model 'in response to a change in a respective mining structure.'"

Thus, as indicated on pages 7 and 9 of the Action, Becker does not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, and where the change in the respective mining structure includes a change in the processing of data from the data set, as recited in claim 10.

[0011] Further, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker. For example, in contrast to claim 10, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla teach that data mining models need their knowledge bases refreshed from time to time because the fundamental characteristics of the underlying production data change over time. (See Vishnubhotla, paragraph [0075]). The cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, and where the change in the respective mining structure includes a change in the processing of data from the data set, as recited in claim 10. Rather, Vishnubhotla teaches that data mining models are

refreshed based on changes to an underlying data set and not reprocessing data mining models based on a change to a mining structure used to create the mining models, where the change to the mining structure relates to a change in the processing of data from the data set. That is, a change to values of an underlying data set is not the same as changing the way that data of a data set is processed according to a mining structure.

[0012] Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 10 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 12-18

[0013] Dependent claims 12-18 ultimately depend upon independent claim 10. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 10. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 12-18. Accordingly, claims 12-18 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 19

[0014] Applicant submits that the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 19:

- "reprocessing, at the computing device, a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model

and the respective mining structure, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure”

With respect to Becker and these features of claim 19, page 9 of the Action states:

“**Claims 10, 12-19, and 21-23** are rejected based on the same reasoning as one or more of the above claims. For example, claim 19 is drawn to substantially the same subject matter as at least claims 1 and 6 discussed above and is rejected based on the same reasons.”

With respect to claim 1 and Becker, page 7 of the Action states:

“Becker as applied above teaches processing, mining models and mining structures, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, but does not expressly teach reprocessing the model in response to a change in a respective mining structure.”

With respect to claim 6, page 8 of the Action states:

“**As to claim 6**, Vishnubhotla as applied above further teaches wherein links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, facilitating changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures.”

Thus, as indicated on pages 7-9 of the Action, Becker does not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the

particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19.

[0015] Further, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker. For example, in contrast to claim 19, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla teach that data mining models need their knowledge bases refreshed from time to time because the fundamental characteristics of the underlying production data change over time. (See Vishnubhotla, paragraph [0075]). The cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19. Rather, Vishnubhotla teaches that data mining models are refreshed based on changes to an underlying data set and not reprocessing data mining models based on a change to a mining structure used to create the mining models. In particular, changes to a mining structure are different from changes to a data set because changes to a mining structure can occur independent of changes to the data set. For example, changes to variables of the data structure can occur without changing values associated with the variables.

[0016] Accordingly, claim 19 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 19 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 21-23

[0017] Dependent claims 21-23 ultimately depend upon independent claim 19. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 19. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 21-23. Accordingly, claims 21-23 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Claims 25-28 Are Non-Obvious Over Becker in view of Vishnubhotla, and further in view of Becker '483.

[0018] Claims 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Becker in view of Vishnubhotla, and further in view of Becker '483. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

[0019] Applicant submits that the cited combination of Becker, Vishnubhotla, and Becker '483 does not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 25:

- “creating one or more of a plurality of mining models, wherein each mining model is predictive of chosen characteristics based on the values obtained from mining structure variables, wherein when there is more than one mining model, one mining model created from a mining structure is not equal to another mining model created from the same mining structure, wherein when a mining model creation function detects that no mining structure utilizing data from the desired data set is currently available,

creating one or more mining models includes creating said mining structure, and wherein links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, facilitating changes relating to discretization of continuous variables associated with the one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures”

- “reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change of a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, wherein the particular mining model is created based on the respective mining structure, and wherein the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized”

With respect to claim 25, page 9 of the Action states:

“**Claim 25** is drawn to substantially the same subject matter as claim 19, as discussed above, in addition to ‘facilitating changes relating to discretization of continuous variables...changed mining structures...based on changing a number of ranges...is discretized,’ in which the combination does not expressly teach”

Thus, as indicated on page 9 of the Action, the combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, where

the links facilitate changes relating to discretization of continuous variables associated with one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 25.

[0020] In addition, as explained previously, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change of a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model is created based on the respective mining structure, and where the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized, as recited in claim 25.

[0021] Further, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker. For example, in contrast to claim 25, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla teach that data mining models need their knowledge bases refreshed from time to time because the fundamental characteristics of the underlying production data change over time. (See Vishnubhotla, paragraph [0075]). The cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change of a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model is created based on the respective mining structure, and where the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized, as

recited in claim 25. Rather, Vishnubhotla teaches that data mining models are refreshed based on changes to an underlying data set and not reprocessing data mining models based on a change to a mining structure used to create the mining models. In particular, reprocessing a particular mining model based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular variable associated with a mining structure is discretized is different from merely refreshing a mining model based on changes to a data set.

[0022] The cited portions of Becker '483 do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Vishnubhotla. In contrast to claim 25, Becker '483 teaches bins representing clouds of scattered data points and arbitrarily choosing a binning resolution. (See Becker '483, col. 4, ll. 50-52 and col. 7, ll. 55-57). Becker '483 does not teach or suggest links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, where the links facilitate changes relating to discretization of continuous variables associated with one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 25. In addition, Becker '483 does not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change of a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model is created based on the respective mining structure, and where the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized, as recited in claim 25. Rather, Becker '483 teaches placing

data in bins, but not that mining models are changed and reprocessed based on a change to the discretization of continuous variables of a mining structure linked to the mining models.

[0023] Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker, Vishnubhotla, and Becker '483 does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 25 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 26-28

[0024] Dependent claims 26-28 ultimately depend upon independent claim 25. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla, and the cited portions of Becker '483 do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 25. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 26-28. Accordingly, claims 26-28 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Claims 2, 11, and 20 Are Non-Obvious Over Becker in view of Vishnubhotla and further in view of Smith

[0025] Claims 2, 11, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Becker in view of Vishnubhotla and further in view of Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Dependent Claim 2

[0026] Dependent claim 2 depends from claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla. For example, as explained previously, the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1.

[0027] With respect to claim 2 and Smith, page 10 of the Action states:

“As to claim 2, Becker/Vishnubhotla as applied above teaches mining structures, but does not expressly teach ‘serving as first class objects in a database.’

However, Smith teaches serving as first class objects in a database (col. 4, ll. 5-45).”

However, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Vishnubhotla. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1.

[0028] Since the cited combination of Becker, Vishnubhotla, and Smith does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, the cited combination also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claim 11

[0029] Dependent claim 11 depends from claim 10, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla. For example, as explained previously, the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, and where the change in the respective mining structure includes a change in the processing of data from the data set, as recited in claim 10.

[0030] With respect to claim 11 and Smith, pages 10-11 of the Action state:

“As to claim 2, Becker/Vishnubhotla as applied above teaches mining structures, but does not expressly teach ‘serving as first class objects in a database.’

However, Smith teaches serving as first class objects in a database (col. 4, ll. 5-45)...

Claims 11 and 20, are rejected based on the same reasoning as one or more of the above claims.”

However, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Vishnubhotla. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was

created from the respective mining structure, and where the change in the respective mining structure includes a change in the processing of data from the data set, as recited in claim 10.

[0031] Since the cited combination of Becker, Vishnubhotla, and Smith does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 10, the cited combination also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 11. Accordingly, claim 11 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claim 20

[0032] Dependent claim 20 depends from claim 19, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla. For example, as explained previously, the cited combination of Becker and Vishnubhotla does not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19.

[0033] With respect to claim 20 and Smith, pages 10-11 of the Action state:

"As to claim 2, Becker/Vishnubhotla as applied above teaches mining structures, but does not expressly teach 'serving as first class objects in a database.'

However, Smith teaches serving as first class objects in a database (col. 4, ll. 5-45)...

Claims 11 and 20, are rejected based on the same reasoning as one or more of the above claims.”

However, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Vishnubhotla. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change with respect to variables in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19.

[0034] Since the cited combination of Becker, Vishnubhotla, and Smith does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 19, the cited combination also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 20. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Claims 30 and 32-34 Are Non-Obvious Over Becker in view of Becker '483.

[0035] Claims 30 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Becker in view of Becker '483. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 30

[0036] Applicant submits that the cited combination of Becker and Becker '483 does not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 30:

- “wherein the system memory includes computer readable instructions executable by the processing unit to:

reprocess the first copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the first mining structure by changing the first manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set; and

reprocess the second copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the second mining structure by changing the second manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set.”

In contrast to claim 30, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from a training set, where the training set has been created from a data set. (See Becker, col. 10, ll. 29-38 and col. 11, ll. 51-67). Further, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from the training set, back-fitting the decision table classifier using the data set, and updating the probability estimates of the decision table classifier. (See Becker, col. 29, ll. 49-58) The cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a first copy of a particular mining model in response to a change of a first mining structure by changing a first manner of discretizing the continuous variables of a particular data set and reprocessing the second copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the second mining structure by changing the second manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set, as recited in claim 30.

[0037] Further, in contrast to claim 30, Becker '483 teaches bins representing clouds of scattered data points and arbitrarily choosing a binning resolution. (See Becker '483, col. 4, ll. 50-52 and col. 7, ll. 55-57). Becker '483 does not teach or suggest reprocessing a first copy of a particular mining model in response to a change of a first mining structure by changing a first manner of discretizing the continuous variables of a

particular data set and reprocessing the second copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the second mining structure by changing the second manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set, as recited in claim 30.

[0038] Accordingly, claim 30 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker and Becker '483 does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 30 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 32-34

[0039] Dependent claims 32-34 ultimately depend upon independent claim 30. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Becker '483 do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 30. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 32-34. Accordingly, claims 32-34 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Claim 31 Is Non-Obvious Over Becker in view of Becker '483 and further in view of Smith

[0040] Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Becker in view of Becker '483 and further in view of Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0041] Claim 31 depends from claim 30, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited portions of Becker and Becker '483. For example, as explained previously, the cited combination of Becker and Becker '483 does not teach or suggest reprocessing a first copy of a particular mining model in response to a change of a first mining structure by changing a first manner of discretizing the continuous variables of a

particular data set and reprocessing the second copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the second mining structure by changing the second manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set, as recited in claim 30.

[0042] With respect to claim 31 and Smith, page 13 of the Action states:

“As to claim 31, Becker/Becker ‘483 as applied above teach mining structures, but does not expressly teach ‘serving as first class objects in a database.’

However, Smith teaches serving as first class objects in a database (col. 4, ll. 5-45).”

However, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Becker ‘483. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a first copy of a particular mining model in response to a change of a first mining structure by changing a first manner of discretizing the continuous variables of a particular data set and reprocessing the second copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the second mining structure by changing the second manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set, as recited in claim 30.

[0043] Since the cited combination of Becker, Becker ‘483, and Smith does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 30, the cited combination also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 31. Accordingly, claim 31 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Claim 35 Is Non-Obvious Over Becker in view of Becker '483 and further in view of Vishnubhotla.

[0044] Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Becker in view of Becker '483 and further in view of Vishnubhotla. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0045] Claim 35 depends from claim 30, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Becker and Becker '483. For example, as explained previously, the cited combination of Becker and Becker '483 does not teach or suggest reprocessing a first copy of a particular mining model in response to a change of a first mining structure by changing a first manner of discretizing the continuous variables of a particular data set and reprocessing the second copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the second mining structure by changing the second manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set, as recited in claim 30.

[0046] With respect to claim 35 and Vishnubhotla, page 13 of the Action states:

“As to claim 35, Becker and Becker '483 as applied above do not expressly teach the claimed subject matter.

However, Vishnubhotla discloses refreshing a mining model because the underlying data changes over time (para. 0075).”

[0047] However, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Becker '438. For example, in contrast to claim 30, the cited portions of Vishnubhotla teach that data mining models need their knowledge bases refreshed from time to time because the fundamental characteristics of the underlying production data change over time. (See Vishnubhotla, paragraph [0075]). The cited

portions of Vishnubhotla do not teach or suggest reprocessing a first copy of a particular mining model in response to a change of a first mining structure by changing a first manner of discretizing the continuous variables of a particular data set and reprocessing the second copy of the particular mining model in response to a change of the second mining structure by changing the second manner of discretizing the continuous variables of the particular data set, as recited in claim 30. Rather, Vishnubhotla teaches that data mining models are refreshed based on changes to an underlying data set and not reprocessing data mining models based on a change to a mining structure used to create the mining models. In particular, reprocessing a particular mining model based on changing a mining structure by changing a manner of discretizing continuous variables of a data set is different from merely refreshing a mining model based on changes to a data set.

Conclusion

[0048] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Trevor E. Lind/

Dated: June 10, 2009

Trevor E. Lind (trevor@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162, x5003)

Registration No. 54785

Reviewer/Supervisor: Emmanuel Rivera (emmanuel@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162, x5001)

Registration No. 45760